



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,835	04/26/2001	Janani Janakiraman	AUS920010095US1	8492
7590	12/08/2003		EXAMINER	
Kelly K. Kordzik 5400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm Street Dallas, TX 75270-2199			NGUYEN, NHON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003	
				3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/842,835	JANAKIRAMAN ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: need to fill out the serial numbers in the "cross reference to related application" session.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rajaraman et al. ("Rajaraman", US 6,366,910).

As per independent 1, Rajaraman teaches a method for presenting graphical data to a user, comprising the steps of:

analyzing a set of graphical data to determine a set of critical factors present in the graphical data (col. 4, lines 10-14);
ranking the determined critical factors according to respective priorities set for each of the critical factors; and generating a textual description of the set of graphical data, ordered according to the priority of the respective critical factor (col. 4, lines 17-33).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rajaraman teaches the set of critical factors and the textual description are selected according to a selected mode (col. 4, lines 5-6).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Rajaraman teaches the mode is selected according to a URL associated with the set of graphical data (*Address* of fig. 1A and 1B).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Rajaraman teaches the priority of the respective critical factor is determined in accordance with said selected mode (col. 4, lines 5-6).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Rajaraman teaches the step of generating said textual description of the set of graphical data includes generating said textual description in accordance with one or more textual templates (col. 4, lines 15-17).

As per independent claims 8 and 15, they are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claims 9 and 16, which are dependent on claims 8 and 15 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 2; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claims 10 and 17, which are dependent on claims 9 and 16 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 3; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claims 13 and 20, which are dependent on claims 9 and 16 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 6; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claims 14 and 21, which are dependent on claims 8 and 15 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 7; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajaraman in view of Hasser et al. ("Hasser", US 5,736,978).

As per claims 4 and 5, which are both dependent on claim 1, Rajaraman does not disclose the step of generating said textual description further comprises the step of generating said textual rendition in an aural format and in an tactile format. Hasser teaches the communication of graphic data provided by tactile sensing and audio related user aids (col. 4, lines 55-63). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Hasser of providing the communication of graphic data by tactile sensing and audio related user aids in Rajaraman's system since it would enable Rajaraman's system to sight impaired people.

As per claims 11 and 18, which are dependent on claims 8 and 15 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 4; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claims 12 and 19, which are dependent on claims 8 and 15 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 5; therefore, they should be rejected under similar scope.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6327574 B1 to Kramer, Glenn A. et al. discloses hierarchical models of consumer attributes for targeting content in a privacy-preserving manner.

US 6125353 A to Yagasaki, Isao discloses mall server with product search capability.

Inquiries

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
November 20, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100